

Trapping Quantum Coherence in Local Energy Minima

Haiqing Wei

Department of Physics, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2T8

E-mail: dhw@physics.mcgill.ca

Xin Xue

*Department of Natural Resource Sciences, McGill University, Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, Quebec,
Canada H9X 3V9*

E-mail: xkhz@musicb.mcgill.ca

S.D. Morgera

Department of Electrical Engineering, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2A7

E-mail: sal@insl.mcgill.ca

Abstract

Clusters of solid-state quantum devices have very long-lived metastable states of local energy minima which may be used to store quantum information. The strong power against decoherence with the great flexibility in state manipulation and system scaling up together should make solid-state devices very competitive in quantum computer engineering.

PACS numbers: 89.80.+h, 03.65.Bz, 71.45.-d

Quantum computers are entrancing machines being able to carry out exceedingly fast algorithms by virtue of the so-called quantum parallelism [1]. Recent research has already showed exponential speed-up of quantum computers over classical ones in performing physical simulations [2] and solving hard mathematical problems like integer factorization [3]. However, implementing a quantum computer is difficult due to the technical obstacle of conveniently manipulating quantum degrees of freedom while preventing environmentally induced decoherence [4] at the same time. Solid-state quantum devices such as quantum dots [5] and SQUIDs [6] can be conveniently fabricated and are good at quantum state manipulation, but they are apparently very short at preserving quantum coherence. All serious implementations of quantum logic exploit natural isolation in some systems such as certain cold trapped ions [7] which may stay at the metastable states for a long time, and nuclear spins [8] that are well isolated from electronic and vibration motions. Preserving quantum coherence is achieved at the cost of awkwardness in logic manipulation and system scaling-up. Up to now, the nuclear spin approach appears the most promising in compromising system isolation and logic manipulation. But several factors make it hard to do quantum logic with a large system. To name but lacking the ability of addressing spins individually, logic operations must be distinguished by different rf pulses. The finite band width of radio frequency limits the size of the computer. Besides, it is not easy to explore the details of spin-spin interactions among a large molecule. As already mentioned, solid-state quantum logic is appealing because of the great convenience in device fabrication and control, especially the well-established technology to construct complex integrated circuits. Furthermore, a solid-state quantum computer will be compatible with conventional electronic computers which may serve as its peripheral equipments. Nevertheless, there is the decoherence problem to be cleared before solid-state quantum computers come out of fancy. In this Letter, we demonstrate how to preserve quantum coherence into local energy minima (LEM) of a cluster of interacting quantum devices and how to carry out quantum logic among such clusters.

It needs at least two distinct states to store a qubit — the smallest unit of quantum information. Any physical system with distinct quantum states may store the logic 0 in its ground state while the logic 1 must go to an excited state. Quantum coherence is spoiled whenever the state of the qubit bearer uncontrollably jumps. Although keeping the system away from energy excitations or lowering the environmental temperature will efficiently prevent upward jumps where energy is gained from the environment, the scheme fails in holding downward jumps back since the system may spontaneously decays and loses its energy even in the vacuum [9]. Different from cold trapped ions and nuclear spins, individual solid-state quantum devices are always strongly coupled to their substrates, let alone the vacuum field. It is unlikely for them to have a long-lived metastable state since the necessary perfect symmetry is always broken by fabrication imperfections. However, a cluster of such devices combined together may have states of LEM which are very long-lived. The notion of LEM often appears in the context of spin-glasses [10] or similar frustrated systems where it refers to a state well decoupled to lower energy states in the sense that all downward transitions are forbidden, spontaneous relaxation stops there. If the system is prepared in a superposition of the ground state and the LEM, quantum coherence would be trapped for a very long time.

A single electron hopping between two weakly coupled quantum dots can be modeled by

a pseudo-spin associated with two Pauli matrixes, σ^z and σ^x . With the basis spanned by the two on-site states $(1 \ 0)^T$ and $(0 \ 1)^T$ where the electron is localized in one of the dots (hence the name on-site state) [11], σ^z is diagonal, $\sigma^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$; while $\sigma^x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ describes tunneling between the two sites. An rf SQUID is an isomorphic system characterized by a double well potential [6] thus falls into the same pseudo-spin model. Such a single pseudo-spin would not be very useful in storing quantum information because its strong coupling to the environment destroys quantum coherence rapidly. But, things could be different in a cluster of pseudo-spins well-separated so that no tunneling among them but there are “spin-spin” interactions $A_{ij}\sigma_i^z\sigma_j^z$ ($i \neq j$) between two pseudo-spins which may originate from the Coulomb on-site repulsion in quantum-dot-clusters [11] or the magnetic coupling between trapped fluxes [12] in rf SQUIDs. Despite its various origin, the interaction is mathematically identical to the Heisenberg exchange picture for ferromagnetic atoms. Indeed, in the context of molecular electronics [13], one may envision doing quantum logic with real electronic spins in an elaborately designed magnetic molecule. Again, though individual spins may be strongly coupled to the molecular vibrations, a spin-cluster could still serve as a good qubit bearer.

To understand why a cluster can stay at the LEM for a long time, let’s simply consider a cluster of pseudo-spins (or even real spins) with ferromagnetic interactions $A_{ij} < 0$,

$$\mathbf{H} = \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \sigma_i^z + \sum_{i=1}^n C_i \sigma_i^x \quad (1)$$

where the bias term $B_i \sigma_i^z$ takes into account the possible difference of on-site energy of the i th pseudo-spin, and $C_i \sigma_i^x$ cares the tunneling between the on-site states. Although the following discussion in the present Letter is based on this model Hamiltonian, the conclusion is valid for a wide variety of spin- or pseudo-spin-clusters. In the limit of very weak tunneling, $C_i \rightarrow 0$, $\mathbf{H}$ is diagonal in the basis expanded by 2^n binary “number states” $|x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n\rangle$, where $x_i = 1$ or 0 corresponding to the up or down state of the i th pseudo-spin,

$$\sigma_i^z |x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n\rangle = \begin{cases} |x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n\rangle, & x_i = 1; \\ -|x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n\rangle, & x_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

Define the distance between two number states $|X\rangle = |x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n\rangle$ and $|Y\rangle = |y_1 y_2 \cdots y_n\rangle$ as $D(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2$. In case the exchange interaction is sufficiently larger than the bias, the two farthest states $|00 \cdots 0\rangle$ and $|11 \cdots 1\rangle$ have the lowest energies, with one say $|11 \cdots 1\rangle$ the LEM and the other the real ground state. Although the cluster at the LEM has extra energy, it stays there quite stably at low enough temperature since a spontaneous transition to the real ground state needs all the n spins flip simultaneously which is highly impossible. To be more specific, any spontaneous transition of the cluster is due to its coupling to the zero-point oscillations of the electromagnetic field or the lattice wave. The coupling Hamiltonian can be generally written as

$$H'(t) = \sum_i F_i(t) \sigma_i^z + \sum_i G_i(t) \sigma_i^x \quad (2)$$

where $F_i(t)$ give fluctuations of the on-site energy and $G_i(t)$ cause deviations of tunneling strength from the mean value (assumed to be zero at this stage). The rate of transition from $|X\rangle$ to $|Y\rangle$ is given by

$$R(X, Y) \propto |\langle X | H'(t) | Y \rangle|^2. \quad (3)$$

The F terms do not lead to transition since they are diagonal in the space of the binary number states. In the first order perturbation, the operator $\sum_i G_i(t) \sigma_i^x$ can only flip one spin, the rate $R_1(X, Y) \equiv 0$ when $D(X, Y) > 1$. Higher order perturbations of $\sum_i G_i(t) \sigma_i^x$ can flip more spins, may eventually cause the notorious spontaneous transition. But the rate R_d of multiphoton processes [9] is very small, decreasing exponentially as the distance $d = D(X, Y)$ increases, $R_d(X, Y) \sim (G/A)^d R_0$, where G is the typical coupling strength between the spin and the perturbation field, A is the typical level spacing in the spin-cluster, and R_0 is a constant. In practice, however, C_i are not zero, though small. The ground state and the LEM are no longer exactly $|00 \cdots 0\rangle$ and $|11 \cdots 1\rangle$. Other number states will mix in. Say the ground state $|X'\rangle$ is almost $|X\rangle = |00 \cdots 0\rangle$, with other number states $|Z\rangle$ mixing in by small amplitudes $\langle X' | Z \rangle$. Using the stationary perturbation theory [14], it is very easy to show $\langle X' | Z \rangle \sim (C/A)^{D(X, Z)}$, where C is the typical value of C_i . $\langle X' | Z \rangle$ becomes exponentially small as the distance $D(X, Z)$ increases. Similarly, the LEM $|Y'\rangle$ is almost $|Y\rangle = |11 \cdots 1\rangle$ with exponentially diminishing mixtures. Now evaluate the overall transition rate by Eq.3, taking into account both the tunneling effect and possible multiphoton processes, one gets

$$R(X', Y') \leq \left(\frac{\max(C, G)}{A} \right)^n R_0 \quad (4)$$

where $n = D(X, Y)$ is the total number of pseudo-spins. We have done computer simulation for small clusters consisting of several spins whose Hamiltonian can be exactly solved. The simulating results are well consistent with the above perturbation theory approach. The conclusion is that increasing the size of the cluster may exponentially prolong the lifetime of the LEM which in turn together with the ground state can store a bit of quantum information for a very long time, in contrast to the common case that a larger system loses quantum coherence faster since the quantum information is usually not stored in the LEM [4]. With reasonable values of $\max(C, G)/A = 0.001 \sim 0.01$, a cluster of 4 or 5 spins can efficiently extend the lifetime of the LEM by up to 10 orders of magnitude. We note that in certain “natural” spin-clusters like a magnetic Mn_{12} molecule, there is indeed a very stable LEM whose life-time could be years long at low temperature [15]. Such natural spin-clusters, if properly exploited, may certainly serve as good quantum registers.

When stored into the ground state and the LEM of a spin-cluster respectively, the logic values 0 and 1 are both well protected against noise. So does any of their superposition. In most possible quantum computer architectures, at each time only one or several qubits are subject to logic operations, many others just serve as quantum register. Although theorists have devised clever coding and error-correcting schemes [16,17] to preserve the delicate quantum coherence in the large quantum register, error correction helps only if it overwhelms the decoherence rate and suppresses more noise than it introduces. On a large system error correction turns to be a heavy burden. Storing quantum information into the LEM and the ground state of a spin-cluster should be very efficient in saving the tedious error corrections for the quantum register, even dismiss them totally. On the other hand, even a small system with several spin-clusters provides us a few exceedingly long-lived qubits, which may be exploited to perform quantum simulation [2], or to create exotic

multiparticle entangled states such as Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen pairs at remote locations, putting the quantum theory into stringent tests. Nevertheless, only good quantum registers are not sufficient for the general purpose of quantum computation. To do quantum logic, one has to bring clusters close so that they weakly interact, apply the proper optical pulses to drive a certain cluster switching between the logic 0 and the logic 1 depending on the state of its neighbors. As it should be, the optical pulses couple the ground state and the LEM of the given cluster to some intermediate states with higher energies, exposing the quantum information to dangerous noise. This may cause “gate errors”. Fortunately, just like “memory errors”, “gate errors” are also likely to be corrected [18]. And as in the context of quantum optics, the technique of “dark-state transfer” [19] should efficiently decrease the risk of spin-clusters staying at higher energy levels, although one has to find a suitable scheme of quantum interference making several intermediate states dark simultaneously. Moreover, it is even possible to do quantum computation directly on encoded qubits so that quantum coherence is always under protection [20,17].

In any aspect, solid-state quantum devices are not only capable of storing and processing quantum information, but even more powerful against decoherence than quantum optics systems like cold trapped ions since the LEM life-time can be easily make longer by increasing the cluster size. Besides, solid-state devices are very flexible in quantum state manipulation and system scaling up. We believe that solid-state quantum devices should be strongly competitive in the emerging quantum computer engineering.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.P. Feynman, Optics News **11**, February 1985; D. Deutsch, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **A 400**, 97 (1985); D.P. DiVincenzo, Science **270**, 255 (1995); A. Ekert and R. Jozsa, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 733 (1996).
- [2] S. Lloyd, Science **273**, 1073 (1996).
- [3] P. Shor, in *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (IEEE Computer Society, 1994).
- [4] W.G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. **A 51**, 992 (1995); I.L. Chuang *et al.*, Science **270**, 1633 (1995).
- [5] K. Obermayer, W.G. Teich, and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. **B 37**, 8096 (1988); W.G. Teich, K. Obermayer, and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. **B 37**, 8111 (1988); W.G. Teich and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. **A 45**, 3300 (1992); A. Ekert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4083 (1995).
- [6] A. Barone and G. Paterno, *Physics and Applications of Josephson Effect* (Wiley, New York, 1982); M.F. Bocko, A.M. Meer, and M.J. Feldman, IEEE Trans. on Applied Superconductivity, March 1997.
- [7] J.I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4091 (1995); C. Monroe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4714 (1995).
- [8] N.A. Gershenfeld and I.L. Chuang, Science **275**, 350 (1997).
- [9] W. Heitler, *The Quantum Theory of Radiation* (Oxford University Press, London, 1954); C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, *Atom-Photon Interactions: Basic Processes and Applications* (John Wiley & Sons, 1992).
- [10] K.H. Fisher and J.A. Hertz, *Spin Glasses* (Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- [11] P.D. Tougaw, C.S. Lent, and W. Porod, J. Appl. Phys. **74**, 3558 (1993).
- [12] D. Davidovic *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 815 (1996).
- [13] F.L. Carter, *Molecular Electronics* (Dekker, New York, 1982); *Molecular Electronics II* (Dekker, New York, 1988).
- [14] L.I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968).
- [15] C. Paulsen and J.G. Park, in *Quantum Tunneling of Magnetization*, edited by L. Gunther and B. Barbara (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995); P.C.E. Stamp, Nature **383**, 125 (1996).
- [16] P. Shor, Phys. Rev. **A 52**, 2493 (1995); A. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996); A. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2252 (1997).
- [17] See the news in New Scientist, 1 March 1997, page 9.
- [18] J.I. Cirac, T. Pellizzari, and P. Zoller, Science **273**, 1207 (1996).
- [19] C.H. Bennett and D.P. DiVincenzo, Nature **377**, 389 (1995).
- [20] W.H. Zurek and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4683 (1996); E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W.H. Zurek, preprint quant-ph/9702058 at <http://xxx.lanl.gov>.